UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT	OF MASSACHUSETTS

CASE NO.

TERESA A. MCCOY Plaintiff)))	05 11283 NO
V.))	AMOUNT \$ 250.00
PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA Defendant)	MCF ISSUED BY DPTY. CLK. DATE

COMPLAINT WITH JURY DEMAND

MAGISTRATE JUDGE (60

Parties

- Plaintiff is Teresa A. McCoy ("Ms. McCoy") an individual having a usual place of residence at East Taunton, Bristol County, Massachusetts.
- Defendant is Prudential Insurance Company of America ("Prudential") an insurance company existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, having a place of business at 213 Washington Street, Newark, New Jersey and doing business in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Jurisdiction and Venue

This Court has original jurisdiction for claims for benefits arising under 29 U.S.C. §
 1132. Venue is proper before this Court, because the plaintiff resides in the eastern district of Massachusetts.

Facts Common to All Counts

- At all times material hereto, Ms. McCoy had been employed as a full time employee of 4. State Street Bank and Trust Company.
- 5. At all times relevant hereto, Ms. McCoy was a beneficiary under a short term and long term group disability insurance plan provided to State Street Bank and Trust Company and its employees and underwritten and administered by Prudential ("Plan").
- 6. The Plan is an "employee welfare benefit plan," as defined by ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1002(1), and may be sued under ERISA as an entity, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(d)(1).
- 7. The Plan is liable for payment of benefits under the Plan.
- 8. Ms. McCoy is a "participant" in the Plan, as defined by ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7).
- 9. At all times material hereto, and since the date that Ms. McCoy first sought short term disability benefits under the Plan, she has been "totally disabled" within the meaning of the terms of the Plan, and has been entitled under the Plan to be paid both short-term disability and long-term disability benefits, and continues to be disabled to date.
- 10. At all times material hereto, Ms. McCoy has internally appealed the Plan's denial of her request for benefits and has followed the requirements of the Plan.
- 11. Ms. McCoy has complied with administrative procedures under the Plan and under ERISA.

- 12. Prudential has not properly been granted authority to make discretionary benefit decisions by either the plan sponsor, plan administrator or the Massachusetts Division of Insurance. To the extent that Prudential contends that it has been granted authority to make discretionary benefit decisions, that authority was self granted by Prudential alone.
- The insurance policy under which MetLife paid benefits to Ms. McCoy was not approved 13. by the Massachusetts Division of Insurance, permitting the use of a clause granting discretionary authority to Prudential to pay benefits as it determined.
- To the extent that Prudential had been granted discretionary authority under the Plan, 14. Prudential abused that discretion and should not been accorded the deference owed to a true fiduciary.

Count I

Benefits Due From Prudential Under ERISA, 29 U.S.C.§ 1132

- 15. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 14 and incorporates the same by reference as if fully set forth herein again.
- 16. As the *de facto* plan administrator and benefit payor, Prudential is operating under a conflict of interest, and to the extent that Prudential contends that its decision to deny benefits under the discretionary standard of review, that contention must be denied, and Prudential's decision must be reviewed under a de novo standard of review.
- 17. Prudential's decision to deny to Ms. McCoy's benefits under the Plan are wrongful whether determined under de novo standard, or the arbitrary and capricious standard, or the heightened scrutiny standard of review.

- 18. Ms. McCoy fulfilled all of the requirements for obtaining benefits under the Plan and the insurance policy of Prudential.
- 19. As a result of Prudential's refusal and failure to pay to Ms. McCoy disability benefits provided to her and to those participants who are totally disabled, Ms. McCoy is entitled to relief against Prudential to recover benefits due to her under the terms of the Plan and insurance policy, to enforce her rights to benefits under the Plan and to clarify her rights to future benefits under the Plan and insurance policy, pursuant to Section 502 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. §1132.

Count II

Breach of Contract Against Prudential

- 20. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 19 and incorporates the same by reference as if fully set forth herein again.
- 21. Ms. McCoy is a direct, or intended third party beneficiary of an insurance contract with Prudential and State Street Bank & Trust Company
- 22. Prudential breached that insurance contract, and caused Ms. McCoy to suffer damages.

Count III

Failure to Timely Provide Plan Document and SPD

23. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 22 and incorporates the same by reference as if fully set forth herein again.

- 24. Ms. McCoy, through her attorneys, made written request for the Summary Plan Description, the Plan documents and other documents required to be disclosed in accordance with ERISA and the United States Department of Labor regulations.
- 25. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1024(b)(4) the plan administrator shall, whether de facto or actual, upon written request of a participant, furnish a copy of the "other instruments under which the plan is operated," and a summary plan description.
- 26. Prudential failed to provide all of the requested documents within thirty days, are a subject to a penalty of as described in 29 U.S.C. § 1132(c)(1) of up to \$110/per day beginning on the thirty-first (31st) day.
 - WHEREFORE, plaintiff Teresa A. McCoy demands relief and judgment against the defendant Prudential Insurance Company of America as follows:
- 1. In an amount of damages to be determined by this Court, or jury, plus pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees allowed by statute or otherwise.
- 2. Injunctive relief declaring the rights and duties of the plaintiff and defendant with respect to past benefits owed to the plaintiff, and future benefits to be paid to the plaintiff.
- 3. For an order precluding a remand of this matter for further determination by the defendant regarding the denial of benefits.
- 4. For a penalty in the amount of \$110.00 per day for each day defendant failed to timely deliver "other instruments under which the plan is operated" and a summary plan description.

5. For such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

PLAINTIFF CLAIMS TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL ISSUES TRIABLE BY JURY.

TERESA MCCOY
By Her Attorneys,

Date: June 17, 2005

Jonathan M. Feigenbaurg, Esq.

B.B.O. N#546686

Philips & Angley

One Bowdoin Square

Boston, MA 02114

Tel. No.: (617) 367-8787

L:\Tmcc001\complaint.wpd

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	ory in whic	h the case belongs b	ased upon t	he numbered nature of s	uit code lis	sted on	the civil	cover shee	t. (See
local re	ule 40.1(a)	(1)).							
2	I.	160, 410, 470, R.23	3, REGARDL	ESS OF NATURE OF SUI	т.				
✓	н.			40, 550, 555, 625, 710, 7 , 850, 890, 892-894, 895			,	ete AO 120 rademark o	or AO 121 or copyright ca
SANARY VAN	III.		0, 345, 350, 3	210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 155, 360, 362, 365, 370,					
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430 690, 810, 861-865		30, 610, 620, 630, 640, 75, 900.	650, 660,				
	V.	150, 152, 153.							
				cal rule 40.1(g)). If more the first filed case in thi	-	orior rel	ated case	e has been	filed in
Has a į	prior actio	n between the same	parties and i	pased on the same claim	ı ever been	filed in	this cou	ırt?	
					YES		NO	1	
	he compla C §2403)	int in this case questi	ion the cons	itutionality of an act of o	congress at	ffecting	the publi	ic interest?	(See
If so, is	s the U.S.A	A. or an officer, agent	or employee	of the U.S. a party?		7-0-00330		- in install	
					YES		NO	An annual	
ls this	case requ	ired to be heard and o	determined t	y a district court of thre	e judges p	ursuant	to title 2	8 USC §228	34?
					YES		NO	7	
						440 (02744			
Massa	chusetts (rnmental agencies of the			d the Con		
	chusetts (-	side in the	same o	d the Con		
Massa	chusetts ("governmental agend	cies"), resid	-	side in the YES	same o	d the Con livision?		
Massa	chusetts ("governmental agend	cies"), resid	ing in Massachusetts re	side in the YES	same o	d the Con livision?	- (See Loc	
Massa	chusetts ("governmental agend If yes, in which div Eastern Division	vision do all	ing in Massachusetts re of the non-governmenta Central Division majority of the plaintiffs	YES	same o	d the Con division? NO Western [- (See Loc	al Rule
Massa	chusetts ("governmental agend If yes, in which div Eastern Division If no, in which divi	vision do all	ing in Massachusetts re of the non-governmenta Central Division majority of the plaintiffs	YES	same of	d the Con division? NO Western [- (See Loc	al Rule
Massa 40.1(d)	chusetts ('). A. B.	"governmental agend If yes, in which div Eastern Division If no, in which divi agencies, residing	vision do all ision do the ag in Massaci	of the non-governmenta Central Division majority of the plaintiffs husetts reside? Central Division	YES Il parties re	same of same o	d the Con livision? NO Western C s, excludi	- (See Loc Division ng governm	nental
Massa 40.1(d) If filling yes, su	chusetts ('). A. B.	"governmental agence If yes, in which diving the satern Division If no, in which diving agencies, residing the satern Division of Removal - are there parate sheet identifying	vision do all ision do the ag in Massaci	of the non-governmenta Central Division majority of the plaintiffs husetts reside? Central Division	YES Il parties re	same of same o	d the Con livision? NO Western C s, excludi	- (See Loc Division ng governm	nental

	44 (R	cv. 3	199)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I.(a) PLAINTIFFS Teresa A. McCoy				DEFENDAN Prudentia		mpany of America	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Bristol (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.			
Phillips & One Bowdoir (617) 367-8	Feigenbaum, Angley Square, Bost 18787	Esq.		Attorneys (If Kn			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)		IZENSHIP OF P Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for De fendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff			Citizo	n of This State	DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or of Business I	Principal Place	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citize	n of Another State 🗆		nd Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 in Another State	
				n or Subject of a eign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI			- Inon-		n . N. coving cvi	OWNER OF ATTUTO	
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of 154EMBERICAR Act 152 Recovery of Defauked Student Loans (Excl. Vetemns) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Force Iosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Peduct Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PRISONER PETITI 510 M otions to Va ca Sentonce Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 De ath Penalty 540 Mandamus & Ot 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	RY 61 62 62 63 64 65 65 65 65 65 65 65	TEITURE/PENALTY 10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs. 50 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Sundards Act 20 Labor/M gmt. Relations 30 Labor/M gmt. Relations 30 Labor/M gmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 H IA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) 864 SSID Title XVI	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reap portionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racke teer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural A ets 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Albeation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determinationality of State Statutes 890 Other Statutory Actions	
Y. ORIGIN Y Original D 2 R Proceeding S	temoved from 3 intate Court	Remanded from [Appellate Court	Reopo	anothe tated or D 5 (specificated	ferred from er district fy)	District Judge from trict 7 Magistrate	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI Claim for disab	ON Do not cite jurisdiction bility benefits	tute underwhich you are fi nal statutes unless diversity S UNGET 29 U	S.C.	§1132			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.	S IS A CLASS ACTION P. 23		mands be determin		rifdemanded in complaint: : X Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY		JUDG E			DOCKET NUMBER		
6/17/05	Just	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF	RECORD			
DECEIDT #	AMOUN U	APPLVING 150	-	HIDGE	MAG III	nge	